kindness, it was thoughtfulness—he had no reason to do it, nothing else. I had never spoken to him about it. I had no reason to expect any-he even thought of that, but he managed to do it. It was just one of the big-hearted, nice things he was always doing.

Q: Yes, I guess that's what made him so admired by his troops; that type of reputation permeated his entire command, I understand?

A: I don't know how many knew it. If you saw a soldier anyplace and asked him what he was in, he would say Patton's Army. He might have served sometimes; nobody served as an army except if you happened to be inside of an army headquarters because army, division, and corps will constantly change between armies. But I never saw a soldier—nine out of ten of them, if you ask them where did you serve in World War II, they would say Patton's Army; that's a great thing. Patton took the eye of the soldier in spite of some of his behavior in slapping.

Q: Did the word of that get around to the other commanders much when that happened?

A: I don't remember. I remember hearing of it, knowing that had happened and that he had been relieved on account of it. It seems to me that Patton was in command down there in North Africa; Bradley was one of his corps commanders, and then when they got up to Sicily, Bradley went in as a corps commander [and] wound up taking Patton's place—that was after the slapping incident. That was over in Sicily, wasn't it; it seems to me it was. I am not sure, I think it was. That was the time he got in the doghouse and he didn't get back; was sent back to the States, as I remember, after that slapping incident. And then he came over with the Third Army—that's later, after the invasion; Bradley had gone on direct to England.

Recap

Q: Well, General, I went back and reviewed my list of questions and original manuscript and it looks like we have covered most everything, but there are a few gaps I would like to fill in. I'd like to first go back to our original discussion, sir, on your being from a military family. You told

me your father wasn't in the military, but you had an older brother who went to West Point and I think he graduated in 1914, Benjamin F. Hoge.

A: He was captain of the football team.

Q: In 1913, I believe. And did you have a younger brother?

A: I had a younger brother, he's dead now, Kenneth. He graduated in 1920.

Q: And, of course, your two sons, William Morns, Jr., and George Freedon Hoge, both attended the Military Academy and graduated in 1941 and 1945. George Hoge is now Colonel George Hoge and is stationed at Fort Leavenworth.

A: He retires this year, in January or November—it is on the month of his birthday and his birthday is January the lst. I think it will probably be the last day of January, I don't know.

Q: So, he will retire after 30 years' service.

A: I don't know if it is 30 years' service or not, but it's that promotion business. If you are not recommended for the next step by the time you are a certain age, you go out. It's all changed now from what it used to be; that's the thing he got caught in. And he got caught. Primarily, he had an excellent record-Vietnam ruined him. He was just crazy to get to Vietnam. He got over there first as an advisor, went over for the combat development people, and he wangled an assistant division commander's job. I've forgotten what division he was with—he stuck with it when he got kicked out, but he was on his way to Vietnam when the big Tet thing happened and he was diverted and had to go down to the Philippines and eventually he got to Vietnam. But the man he was supposed to relieve was on leave up in Hong Kong. His G-3 or his chief of staff of that division was away too. He arrived there absolutely cold in the middle of all this mess. It wasn't his fault. I think he finally came out all right, but when the division commander finally came back, he put all the blame on George. George hadn't come in until after this thing had happened, and the people who knew something about it [were gone]. He may have known some of his commanders, combat commanders or

regimental commanders. I don't know what the organization was, but he had no acquaintance with them other than casual, and he was thrown right in the middle of the worst period they ever had in Vietnam. He was blamed for their troubles and they canned him; he wouldn't give up, so he stayed in Vietnam and he went around looking for a job and he finally got one with a fellow in the 1st Cavalry Division, I think. They took him on as support commander.

Q: I think he was support commander for the 10lst.

A: Well, whatever it was. Well, anyway, he finished his tour there and he had made a very good reputation, but that wasn't what he wanted; he wanted combat. But he was very lucky, and he finished his tour with 101st. But his trouble was not his; his deficiency came from his division commander, who was away in Hong Kong, and his—I don't know whether his chief of staff or—all of the people who should have helped him that knew something about the organization and where they were, were away on leave when he arrived in the middle of all this turmoil. Everything was in a mess and he caught the blame for it. But there wasn't anything he could do; there was no use in trying to fight anything like that. You just swallow it and make the best of it that you can.

Q: That brings me to another question that I was going to ask later on, but it's appropriate now to bring it up, and that's the effect of that type of thing which reflects on the efficiency reports. What are your feelings about the Army efficiency report system?

A: I don't think they are worth a damn. We have had so many of them since I was in the service. All kinds-and most of them were made out without—just to keep from condemning somebody, and you rated everybody as satisfactory, very satisfactory, excellent, so only time—once in a while you had a man who would stand out and you had nerve enough to give him superior; and it was very seldom that you ever rated a man inferior and class-B'd him because that always caused a fight, too. So to suggest a question, the rest of it didn't mean anything. Satisfactory, very satisfactory, or one of those ratings meant absolutely nothing. Just meant he didn't know you very well or he had nothing particularly against you or for you. There were only two ratings that meant anything and that was the top one and the very bottom one. Those were the only two you could

do much about. I was very careful about the ratings on the excellent, and I was extremely careful on the inferior. But otherwise it was more or less routine and meaningless. I've never seen my own efficiency reports, never looked at it; I have no idea what they say.

Q: You never went by [Army personnel to review your record]?

A: I never went by, I have no conception of what's in them, good or bad or anything else.

Q: Well, the question of efficiency reports brings up another question that bothers the-Army man and is often discussed, and that is the question of ethics. It's been particularly leveled at the battalion command level, which is the lowest level that the troops see of what he thinks is Department of Army structure. There have been some charges leveled at the battalion commander today that he is more interested in getting a good efficiency report than he is in doing a good job; and in order to protect that efficiency report, [he] sometimes had to lower his own code of ethics in order to report to his commander the things he thought the commander wanted to hear, rather than what was actual truth.

A: I don't believe in that. I don't know whether it's practiced nowadays or not. Personally I am absolutely opposed to it, have no tolerance of that sort of behavior.

Q: Well, did you find this type of behavior in any of your experiences?

A: I don't think so. I don't remember any particular instances of that. You evaluate them and you don't just make broad judgment of these things. You are on a scale when those things come up; you are very careful. That is, I always was and I suppose the rest of them were. But I never thought that was a major element.

Q: I don't think that is major now. It happens, but I think it's the exception rather than the rule.

A: Well, if it is, the commander shouldn't be there, that's all. He should have somebody else, because he doesn't deserve it.

Q: Well, when you were in Seventh Army in USAREUR, had they instituted the Army readiness reporting system, where the units were rated according to their combat readiness?

A: I don't remember. We had constant tests of combat readiness. We had alerts and maneuvers and all of that. Whether there was any rating of those, I don't remember. I don't think so.

Q: How about the Command Maintenance Management Inspection, the CMMI; did you have that at that time?

A: I don't think so; I don't remember.

Q: I don't think that came in until later on. Let me go back to your family a little bit, sir, particularly to your sons. Did they ever approach you for advice on your philosophy of the Army and, if so, what type of advice did you give them?

A: I can't say definitely. There were few times when they came in to ask for advice or guidance or anything else. I did advise George when he got in his trouble that you had to stick it out and keep your mouth shut and do the best you could; you couldn't fight it. In Bill's case, he had a lot of trouble; he was very strong-headed; he was always sort of a lonely person ever since he was a boy.

He got in trouble at West Point, got turned back, got court-martialed. They were ready to kick him out of West Point. While he was there—I don't know what had happened-anyway, he was in the hospital. I think he had a fight with some other person. Anyway, he was in the hospital with, I don't know, a broken hand or something; and he decided he wasn't going to stick around there all the time, just lying in the bed. So one night he got up, slipped out of the window, and went down to Highland Falls and got some beer. Well, in those days any alcohol was a matter of dismissal. As you mentioned, in my class there were four of those men who came back that had been kicked out four or five years ago

because they had a bottle of beer on the maneuver, and that was all they had. There wasn't any drunkenness. But the rule in those days—well, anyway, Bill was court-martialed. I was in the Philippines at the time and a classmate of mine, who was at West Point, sent me a cable in the Philippines. I couldn't do a thing about it because the mail in those days took a month. And there was nobody-but wiring, or something like that, a cable to get back; but I had a cousin who was a lawyer here in Cleveland. He was a law partner of Newton D. Baker. He was also a very strong man. He went to West Point, went to see the superintendent and interceded in some way. I've forgotten, but they got Bud's dismissal changed to a year's suspension, and he was turned back a class. So he went off and went to Kansas State University. I think my brother-in-law was out there at KSU—stayed with them for a year and then went back to West Point and finally graduated.

But he always had the reputation of being highly independent, sort of tough. He made a good record in the war. He was wounded twice; he stayed on for a while, but he still limps or is lame from that. He was shot through the back of the knee and [the bullet] cut the nerves so that he was absolutely paralyzed from the knee down in one of his legs; and he also had a bullet wound someplace else during the Fulda Gap business, but he made a good record as a soldier. But he got disgusted with the whole thing. He had a lot of service around the world. He was an instructor at the Artillery School—did an excellent job, I understood, I heard—some people told me about it, that he was an excellent instructor. He later was an instructor at Leavenworth. He got in trouble there with a fellow he says is a liar, and he called him that. He was his supervisor, head of a section, and he told him to his face that he was lying; and the man got sore about it and finally practically ran him out of Leavenworth.

Well, then he went off some other place. But he was in Taiwan as an advisor, and he was also in Saudi Arabia as an advisor. Both of those tours were two years, I guess. He made a good reputation and he did very well. But he was always so damned independent. He knew what was right; his principles, he never varied, absolutely honest and straightforward; but sometimes he got in trouble, as he did by that instructor that headed his section. But he told him right to his face in the man's office that he was lying about something that he charged, and the man got on his tail and finally drove him out. Well, that's very personal and you fight those things. I never had that much trouble with anybody

in my period, but you do and the only thing you can do is stick with it and fight it out if you are on the right side and you believe in yourself.

Q: Yes, I think you would have done the same thing yourself. When they were youngsters, did you have to use any personal influence to get them to go to West Point?

A: No, they were just crazy to go. I helped in many ways to get an appointment; I know the one I got for Bud was while I was District Engineer in Memphis. And there was a congressman up in Arkansas along the Mississippi River just north of Memphis; he was a good friend of mine. My office happened to be across the river, so I could claim my residence in Arkansas. I was living over in Memphis, but my office was in Arkansas. Bud took the competitive-I didn't ask for a special appointment. I said, "You will take an examination against anybody, " and he took one. This congressman gave a competitive examination for his appointment and Bud came out way up to the top, ahead of–Well, all of them were so far below him there was no question of the choice. I think he got about 90 on his entrance examination and the next one closest to him was 45 or 50. George got his own appointment, but he had a number of alternates from different friends.

We had lived so many places, but he had an alternate from Arkansas, one from Missouri; he had one from Florida; he had one from Nebraska; they were all alternates. But he chose to take the alternate from Missouri because that's where our home was—our roots. And he took the competitive examination. I think he took the competitive examination; no, I think he got the principal, Dewey Short, to appoint him. I've never known Dewey, but he got it through friends that knew Dewey Short. At any rate, I can remember I was at Trieste at the time. Dewey Short then was chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, I think, in Congress. He was making a tour trip to the west. Anyway, I went out to meet their plane and I knew who appointed George to West Point; and I was going to say as soon as Mr. Short got off the plane-I'd never met him—I was going to greet him, and then I was going to say, 'You appointed my son to West Point. " Dewey Short came down the steps of the plane, had his hand out: "I appointed your son to West Point. " But Dewey stayed with us a couple of days, enjoyed him. He had been on a big drunk. He had lost his hat. Mrs. Hoge took him downtown, and he had met two of these nice girls in the hat shop down there. He didn't buy one hat, he bought

two; and he was just overwhelmed with these girls, and he finally took off. He was a great guy.

Q: Well, would you have influenced your boys in any other way?

A: I didn't. We purposely sent Bud to an Episcopal high school in Alexandria for his precollege education, so that he could see what civilian life was and associate with people. It was done purposely because we did not want him to feel that he was bound to the Military Academy; but after he went there, he had only one ambition—to go to West Point.

Q: That's marvelous. I am sure that your service contributions had a lot to do with them. They were obviously very proud of your record.

A: Bud entered West Point in—I know the year that we went to the Philippines, he went with us by ship, by transport from New York to San Francisco; and then he got off the boat at San Francisco and took the train back to West Point to enter; and we went on to the Philippines.

Q: It must have been about 1936.

A: It was about that time.

Q: You mentioned your wife and her importance to your Army career. I'd like to talk a little bit about that—primarily because we had some captains visit the War College this week and neither of the two young fellows were very interested in whether or not their wives did have an interest in the Army. And they tried to separate totally the two careers, or rather they tried to separate their careers from their family life or from their wives, which seems to me an impossible task.

A: Well, it is. But my wife was always behind me a hundred percent, and she was always delighted to make a move no matter how nice, how much she liked the place we were. When we got orders to go someplace else and just up and moved to go try something new, she loved it. She was a great soldier. I don't know-I may have neglected her a lot for I was away a great deal of time in the various wars and so on—though there was

a period in between there. But she stuck with me and gave me a great deal of help.

Nettie Fredendall Hoge taken about 1954.

Q: That's very important and is the most important part of a successful Army career, I think. Was your wife a Missouri girl also, sir?

A: Yes.

Q: Was she a hometown girl?

A: She was from Lexington, Missouri. I had known her. I had gone to kindergarten with her. Not kindergarten, but down in the primary school. I had known her a little while; then I'd gone to Wentworth as a cadet. I knew her in those days when she used to come to the dances and so on. Then I knew her at West Point. She went to school at Bryn Mawr and she used to come up to West Point—Hundredth Night and various times. We got married just after World War I was declared, actually.

Q: So, you remained a bachelor for a short time after graduation. You did have a little bit of bachelor life after you graduated?

A: Oh, just down on the border in Fort Brown.

Q: Shifting to another subject in a way, you are a little unusual in the career pattern in that you never worked on the Army Staff or in the Office of the

Joint Chiefs. Did you ever feel that was a hindrance to you in the performance of high command?

A: No, I never was interested in it at all. I don't think I would have done well with it. I had no interest in it and I wasn't interested in that side of it. I don't feel I qualified for staff work.

Q: Well, didn't you sometimes feel that those people back at Department of Army didn't know what they were doing when you were in the field?

A: I never thought much about it. There were times, of course, when you always criticize somebody; that's perfectly normal, but I don't know. As far as I was concerned I had good support-the little bit I had to refer back and get support from the War Department, the Department of the Army, and all the rest of them.

Q: Your tour at the Infantry School—you've commented that the best school you've seen in the Army system was the Infantry School.

A: Under General Marshall.

Q: Yes, and he was a colonel at that time, I believe, sir, the assistant commandant?

A: He was the assistant commandant.

Q: Some of the other instructors there you mentioned included General J. Lawton Collins and General Ridgway.

A: Stilwell was there. The whole outfit-Arnold, who was the division commander in field artillery. Bradley was there. Practically everybody that was at that place at that time later became a division commander or higher, and they all took top commands. There was nothing—nothing unusual about the selection of people that went there, but I think their training and Marshall's inspiration had a great deal to do with it. By the way, did you ever read that last book of Forrest Pogue's on Marshall, *General Marshall, Organizer of Victory?*

Q: No, sir, I didn't, but I will.

A: That is the greatest history of World War II. It covers a different side, but it gives you a different picture of World War II than any other. That should be absolutely must reading.

Q: What was the name of that book again, sir?

A: *George C. Marshall, Organizer of Victory. I've* got a copy, but I've loaned it to a friend of mine and he has it now and I can't show it. It's by Forrest Pogue. It's published by the Association of Marshall Memorial thing down at Lexington, Virginia. He is something—whether he is director—or—he wrote the book though. And it gives you a—I don't know-picture of the inside workings and the dealings and difficulties of all them throughout—Churchill and Roosevelt, and, of course, Eisenhower is in it. Marshall backed Eisenhower to the hilt. Marshall wanted to be commanding that force in Europe, the invasion force, and he was urged to do it. I think it was very fortunate that he didn't because there is nobody that could have done the job he did back in Washington in keeping together the British and American Chiefs of Staff and the French and all the rest of them and his planning of the whole thing; also his handling of MacArthur-though they were not very friendly at the time, MacArthur and Marshall-but he handled him perfectly. It just glorifies the man, and it should be read and studied, that book.

Q: Well, I will pass that along and make a point to read that.

A: You should read it.

Q: Because I have often wondered as I am sure many others have, that General Marshall stayed on as Chief of Staff during World War II.

A: No one could have filled his position as Chief of Staff of the Army.

Q: So you feel it was fortunate that way rather than the reverse?

A: Very fortunate, but he was always helping Eisenhower. He never interfered with him. He advised him several times and helped him, and he supported all the rest of them. But his fights with Churchill and Roosevelt are really something.

Q: That would be very interesting reading to see the power of the military as advisor to civilian leaders.

A: He did it all; he was it.

Q: You mentioned, I believe, in one of our earlier conversations that General Marshall also advised General Eisenhower on a personal matter that recently came to view in the Truman book.

A: I never mentioned that and I never heard of it; that came out in the newspaper.

Q: Yes, sir, I guess that's why we discussed it before.

A: I don't know whether that is true or not. I heard those rumors at the time about Eisenhower's liaison with a British WAC [Kay Summersby], a secretary, but I don't know whether it was true and I had no reason to believe it was.

Q: I don't think he touches on that at all. That came out in Truman's memoirs, and some newspaperman got a hold of that. It isn't in his book at all. Going back to the Infantry School and your comment on the value of the Infantry School and the people there, all of whom later achieved greatness, did you ever feel that you might have missed something by not attending one of the senior service colleges, the Army War College?

A: I wanted to go to the Army War College; as I told you, I think, in one earlier conference, I intended and I had been after the War College all the time. But this opportunity that came to go to the Philippines and there was only one vacancy for a person of my rank in the Philippines and that only came up after a full tour of duty, and it happened when I was in Memphis. I had been promised that I would go to the War College the

next fall. But I asked the Chief of Engineers to cancel that and let me go to the Philippines because I would have never gotten to the Philippines—I never [would have] had that opportunity.

Q: Well, on your return from the Philippines you had–

A: Well, I was too old then. I had gone on district work in Omaha and then later, of course, the war broke out; so it was all over with.

Q: But you do think it might have been valuable, as was the Infantry School?

A: I am sure the War College was very valuable, and I had wanted it. That's the only other college I wanted to go to, but I gave it up on that account. It was either that or I'd never go to the Philippines. I wouldn't have had that experience or that foreign service. And Mrs. Hoge wanted to go very much.

Q: Well, shifting subjects again, sir, we talked a little bit about your reflections on the professionalism of the Army, the officers, and NCO corps. Is there any particular time where you thought it was low, perhaps between World Wars I and II, and when the professionalism and capability of the officer and NCO was the best?

A: Well, I knew it went awfully low between the two wars up until after demobilization in 1921 or something like that; we got down to nothing, just barely could live. Units were down; maybe a company would be 25 men if they had that many. At that time, we had some extra noncoms. There weren't many and you couldn't hold anybody and you couldn't get recruits. The pay in those days was so small; I think about that time it was $18 a month or something like that. So you couldn't get new ones in. We had some fine old noncoms, but there was none of this corps of noncoms at the time or any of the building up that has taken place since then. Each organization had its own noncoms and there was no transferring back and forth. Of course, we had gotten some wonderful noncoms in the First World War, who all became officers. I knew practically every man I had—some went as high as a colonel after the war came out—from a sergeant to a colonel. There were many of them who were captains and company commanders, some battalion commanders,

supply officers. They were fine people, but they were old career soldiers who had been in—some of them had combat in the Spanish-American War. But then they disappeared completely. I got down to where I didn't have anybody except a lot of people who were in the guardhouse, and they turned out in that first company I had with the 7th Engineers. I had all the bums, the guardhouse-when we got those people. But when you gave them responsibility and put it on them, I'll say this: when I went to France with that outfit, I had the best noncoms in the Army; we could do anything. And they all jumped from privates; they were buglers, guardhouse people, everything. They had gone from that to what was the senior—higher than the sergeant first class—anyway, it was platoon sergeant. But they had tops—one of these platoon sergeants, his boast was he'd lick any man in his platoon.

Q: Sometimes, I think it's unfortunate that type of discipline is gone.

A: They were all right and they were highly respected. A number of them got to be commissioned to officers. Now those, that second group, they went up to lieutenants and higher, who had before that spent most of their time in the guardhouse, before the war.

Q: Well, do you see any parallel now between the draw down of the Army and the armed forces and the demobilization after World War I?

A: I don't think it is nearly as bad now as it was at that time. But I know so little about it, but it's much superior now than after the First World War. That was absolutely getting down to nothing; we were just barely able to live, to get somebody to cook or serve or take care of the barracks. There was nothing.

Q: We haven't gone that far.

A: We were down to dregs. We only had a few of the old men. They were good men. There was no question about that, but that was all that was left.

Q: Well, now with the high personnel cost, we have a relatively small standing army with the augmentation by the National Guard and Reserve forces under the one-army policy or total force policy. What are your thoughts on the capabilities of the National Guard and Reserve to quickly mobilize and augment a small standing army?

A: They must improve a hell of a lot since any of my experience with them. I've been on maneuvers with them when I was still commanding the Fourth Army and I had little wonder—one or two divisions down there that were pretty good. I remember there was one from Minnesota that was pretty good. This Ohio division wasn't worth a damn. They didn't know anything; they didn't have discipline; they couldn't shoot; they couldn't maneuver; they would starve to death if you put them out. And I think many of the rest of them are the same way. Now they can improve but their officers were ill equipped; it was all political. Of course, that all goes back—we are talking back now to 1952 or 1953; that's the last time I had anything to do with them. But they were no good at that time; I wouldn't trust them anyplace.

Q: What do you think could be done to make them more capable?

A: I think this integration, I thought it went on. I don't know whether it did or not, but the fact that the training in the Army—go through the first year or something and then they were transferred. Wasn't that the policy for a while? And they could take the National Guard or the Reserve and finish out their enlistment. They had enough basic training. The trouble is the National Guardsmen didn't have any basic training; he had—what was it—once a month or once in two weeks. He went down for an hour's drill. Well most of them had no drill at all. They would just sit around and chew the rag. And the officers didn't know anything; they were incapable. I thought the ones I had in Texas in those days were absolutely useless, and I saw the same thing before the First World War when they had the mobilization on the border. I saw a whole division—no, it wasn't a division, it was an artillery brigade—routed by rain, and they just took off in the middle of the night. They were on a maneuver down towards Port Isabel, south of Brownsville, and I wasn't with them except I was maintaining a road; that was my job. But I had to go out there. And that morning right after the rain, the woods were just full; and there was about a mile wide and they were all heading for town. They had abandoned their rifles, their tents, everything, and the rainstorm had just taken all.

And the commanding general of the brigade was on a horse and he was headed with them and he had a couple of men hanging on his stirrups, dragging them into town. It was an excellent rout, and it was all done by rainstorm.

Q: That was at Brownsville along the border?

A: That was 1917.

Q: Between the world wars, we had sort of a volunteer army; what was in was volunteers. Do you believe the present attempt to achieve an all-volunteer army in today's social atmosphere is realistic?

A: I don't know; I question it. They seem to be making headway. It seems to me that the expense must be terrific. I don't understand that, the pay and all of that and the privileges; and they seem to be drawing men from what our reports say here. I saw something here, a report from the Secretary of the Army. The other day I got a report from the War Department on that mailing list, and they showed the Army was ahead of their quotas on—

Q: Overall, it's holding up.

A: For a while the Air Force and the Navy were getting all the—and we were dragging behind, but recently the Army has come up. I don't know how it is going to work out.

Q: You know part of the all-volunteer army, of course, is the increase in personnel cost, the increase of personnel pay. But it seems like every time we get something like that, we come under fire from Congress for spending too much money, and they start cutting away at some of the traditional benefits, such as commissary, PX, medical care, and so forth. What are your thoughts on possible reductions in these traditional side benefits for Army personnel?

A: I don't know about this; there have always been attacks on the post exchanges. That's been all throughout my career-and the

commissaries-that is brought on by the merchants and so on in nearby towns. I don't know whether it's going to turn out or not. Well, of course, the advocacy of a volunteer army came from Congress itself, and Senator Kennedy is one of the big proponents; he is a proposer of it. So we have—the only person that can take the blame of the volunteer army has to go back to Congress because they are the ones that proposed it. So it may last; whether they will stand for the expenses is another question.

Q: Well, these fringe benefits that we are discussing, particularly medical care, do you think those fringe benefits-medical care, commissary, PX, and so forth-do you think that those are worthwhile items which attract people to join and stay in the Army, or [what] do you think that their value is?

A: I don't think they help to stay in. They make them more satisfied. I don't know that anybody ever came into the Army on that account; if they didn't have them, they would have more difficulty and trouble in getting them. And, of course, whether it's true today as much as it used to be, the army post, cantonments, and so on were so isolated from markets and so on that the commissary and that part became essential. We would be 10, 15 miles away from the nearest supermarket and that was the reason. Later, of course, they got to building them closer into town; as soon as you get close to a town, the merchants all rise up and demand the closing of the commissary and PX. And when we were at Belvoir, I don't know how—in those early days when it was then Camp Humphreys—how you would have ever gotten your groceries or food. The closest place was Alexandria, which was about 12 miles away and was over a road that at that time was practically impossible.

Q: So you think the value of the—traditional value of the commissary within the United States is probably less now than it was?

A: It may be less now. I am not sure whether commissary prices-I've known in many cases where commissary prices were not competitive with the civilian prices. I've heard that, but I don't know.

Q: In some items.

A: In some items. I've heard the same thing on the Class VI stores. You can buy liquor at cut-rate stores in town cheaper than you can at the Class VI. I don't know how true that is.

Q: It's true around Washington. Have you heard about the Army's Project 100,000, wherein we bring in people in category 4, the less educated people, and try to train them and then give them back to society better trained and a more useful individual? Are you familiar with that program?

A: No, I am not.

Q: In that light do you think the Army as an institution should be involved with the correction of some of the social problems in the country?

A: I don't think so; but I think by the type of recruit, we've got to do some of that work to make him a decent soldier. I know at one time we had to start classes in reading and writing and simple arithmetic, just grammar school classes in the Army, but that was before this requirement. You had people that couldn't understand instructions-they couldn't read a letter, they couldn't read orders–and we started that. We had schools, and I've forgotten now the hours, but I remember that they were during your duty; and it seemed to me every afternoon and maybe part of the morning and the afternoon, we had schools that were educating these soldiers that didn't have the basic education, enough to know what they were listening to. Well, when you get that type of recruit, you've got to do something with him.

Q: Or turn them back, eliminate them from your service?

A: Well, in those days we couldn't get anything else. I don't know. I don't think the Army should be put in a job to educate the civilians, no. If you have that then you are going to miss your military purpose of being there; you are wasting money, to spend the money on military and do some educational work.

Q: I am sure you have heard the story from many people that many of the troops that got in trouble, and I heard this as late as 1959 in Europe, would have a man constantly getting in trouble and finally asked him why he came in the Army. He says—well, a judge gave him a choice of going to jail or going into the Army. Do you think this type of man should be in the Army?

A: We have had this a long time. No, he shouldn't be taken. We should not be used as a penal institution. There is no question about that, and that has been turned down for years. That's an old thing that goes back 40 or 50 years throughout all my service. There used to be judges or justices of the peace or something like that, who would give the man-I suppose he was a petty criminal-but they would give him the choice of either going to jail or enlisting in the Army. And they would take that choice, but that wasn't a good break; that was against the law, and it has been outlawed for years. But it was done; I don't know whether it's done now or not.

Q: Not openly.

A: Well, it shouldn't be. And whenever it comes to light it should be stopped, because you shouldn't get that reputation.

Q: Well, I am going to shift subjects again. You have always been a user of equipment as an operator and commander in the field and you have never been involved, I don't think, with the Army Procurement, Research and Development System. What are your thoughts on the R&D and procurement system of the Army; do you think the Army has always gotten the type of weapons it needed?

A: I really am not qualified to talk on that. I know so little about it. I know we were deficient at times and there were times when we had to take over from the Marines or somebody else that had a better weapon and sometimes they had to take it from us.

Q: Well, you made a comment on the weight of the tank; I believe that you had one company in each armor battalion with the Pershing tanks and two companies with—

A: That was later in the war that we got the Pershing.

Q: Do you think it was that great an improvement over the Sherman?

A: No, I don't think so; it had a better gun.

Q: It had a 90-mm. gun.

A: Much better gun. I thought the Pershing in the old days was a pretty good thing except the gun was underpowered. When we got that 76-mm. high velocity—of course, the original gun was only a 75-mm. as I understand-that was relatively low velocity. The Germans were using an 88-mm. and that was a wonderful gun; the Germans had that in the First World War.

Q: So you think the main thing wrong with the Sherman was the gun?

A: It wasn't the only thing; you got advances, but the Sherman was a damned sight better than they developed after they spent all this money and slowed things off. But I think they went off on the wrong track myself. My views are what I told you the other day—the tank is supposed to move and if it doesn't move it's no longer a tank. It loses its value-and it's got to be quick. Now firepower is the next, to me. The mobility is number one, number two is firepower, and number three is protection. But the trouble is with these later tanks everything went into protection; heavy armor weighed them down. Of course, I think there always has been the trouble with the engine. We made a great mistake in the Second World War and we lost the diesel engine, which would have been a great saving and they are much more efficient. The Marines got the diesel; we had to give it up and there wasn't enough of them to go around, so we took gasoline engines.

Q: Colonel George Hoge has had two assignments with the Combat Development Command which represent your views. Have you had any discussions with him over the modem-day methods?

A: No, I have never discussed it.

Q: Sir, you mentioned yesterday that you enjoy reading history. What are your thoughts on the value of history and tradition for the modern soldier?

A: Well, it's a great inspiration to know what can be done; I have enjoyed history more than any other subject. And you can't imitate other people. You've got to be yourself, but you can learn from other people. As I told you, I think Robert E. Lee was the greatest of all, and his Freeman biography is an excellent one—and George Washington. There are numbers of others, I don't know how many; I must have a hundred or more different biographies and histories back here that I've read and enjoyed very much.

Q: Well, in Seventh Army, sir, do you think enough time was devoted in the training period to instill a feeling of tradition among the troops? Going back to any of your commands, sir, do you think they really got enough on history and tradition of the Army?

A: Oh, no, I don't think so; that was never emphasized.

Q: You feel it should be?

A: Well, I don't know that you've got time with the soldiers; the officers should get as much as they can of that. You are so busy with soldiers, training them, that you can't put that other in. You've got to train them to march and shoot, [to] take care of themselves in the field, and to obey orders. There are a number of those things that are basic and you—when you get up into the tradition, that's beyond them, but it belongs to the Officer Corps, there is no question about that—and the higher noncoms too. I don't understand this present noncom situation; it's so new to me. They have tried to elevate them to something, and I have no objection to it. But I don't know anything about it and I haven't had any experience with it.

Q: I think it's settling back now that we will keep the supergrades E-8, E-9, probably; but some of the so-called instant NCOs that we were getting during Vietnam, that program has been stopped. Let me get back into your high command experience, particularly in Europe as Seventh Army

and CINCUSAREUR. Today there is quite a debate between the elements of Department of Defense, particularly between the service and the Office of Secretary of Defense, having to do with the amount of warning time we can expect in Europe in case of an attack by the Soviet Union. Do you feel that the Soviet capabilities and intentions can be interpreted far enough in advance to allow sufficient warning time to reinforce troops and equipment in Europe?

A: I don't know anything about that. I couldn't tell you. Of course, they have changed so much with the ability to air-transport; that was demonstrated in the last war [October 1973] in Israel, moved all those tanks and equipment very fast over there. So the possibility is so much more. I don' t know what we know about the Russian intentions.

Q: Some have compared the October War, the Yom Kippur War, and the techniques used by the Egyptians as the same techniques we could expect the Soviets to use if there were ever a conflict or approached a conflict. But many of our valuable people think there will be enough diplomatic and military warning to give us the time to get these—

A: That's other people. I don't know what we can know about them. I doubt that we know much because they are very secretive and how much we know-Mr. Kissinger is doing a great job, I think, and maybe we've got good G-2s and military attaches have learned something. I don't know about that. I wouldn't trust the bastards anyplace. They are entirely out in their whole concept that they must dominate the world—that's what I object to. You were asking why I object to the Vietnam business—we are trying to dominate. We are trying to do what the Russians are trying to do all over the world, except they are trying to reverse it—they want to make us all Communists, we want to make them all Democrats. And I don't think—you've got to suit the people themselves; that's none of our business. That's purely my own philosophy and it has nothing to do with my knowledge or experience or anything. The only experience I've had with the Russians-I did personally have relations with General Grechko, who is now the Minister of Defense, when I was in command in Europe, several times; it was only casual. I visited him and he visited me, and we exchanged Christmas presents every year. He is the top man, the Minister of Defense; he is a tough old bastard, too.

Q: Yes, sir, many of them are. They are masters of negotiations because of their philosophies, I guess. You mentioned yesterday that you changed the planning for the conventional defense of Europe from the give-ground-and-save-time philosophy and scorch-the-earth philosophy into a stand-and-hold more organized defense and retrograde.

A: Well, I recommended how far it went—but I stopped that. When I was there it was just going to be one grand rush to the rear destroying everything behind you, which I felt was absolutely wrong; and it would have discouraged any allies we had—to bum everything, to destroy the country behind us and to move out just as fast as you could—there is no excuse for that.

Q: Well, do you think the Seventh Army had at that time the capability to stop a Russian attack?

A: We weren't stopping anything. It was a delaying action, but we could fight. I don't object to destroying bridges ahead of them that they could use, if you are fighting on the way back to delay their advance, but this business of this scorched earth, which was then the policy, and to run like hell—everybody get up and move.

Q: Was that a political or military policy?

A: I don't know. It was one that I found was there, and I made every effort to change it. How effective it was—because I didn't stay there long enough with the Seventh Army, but I recommended it.

Q: Did the approval for that change have to come back to the Department of the Army, or did you have the approval of—

A: It went on up to USAREUR or EUCOM; how far back it had to go, I don't know. But I changed it within my capabilities at that time. And I left—see I went up to USAREUR in November, October maybe; that year we had been on maneuvers and we had discussed these plans before that. We had never put them into effect and I know we had groups out there. The engineers were one of them, particularly, whose mission

was—because I went out there and saw them and talked to them—whose mission was to carry this plan out.

Q: In your experience you have been involved in two so-called total wars, World War I and World War II, and "limited war" in Korea, and the recent experience in Vietnam. Do you think that this concept of total war is completely gone now because of the mass destruction capability held by modem armies?

A: I couldn't tell you that; I couldn't say. When we get into a war, you know, there is no substitute for winning. You've got to win a war however you've got to do it. When you get into a major war, there is no substitute for victory.

Q: In a major war, [but] how about the limited-type thing, as in Vietnam or Korea?

A: I don't know how that's going to work out or not. If the thing gets big enough, it is going to become a major war now, because the thing is going to be to defeat the enemy and make it knuckle under as fast as you can do it. That I would think would be the policy; you can't drag it on. That, of course, is beyond my sphere and everything else, but I would suspect that.

Q: Much of the philosophy of many of the high level government officials says that the concept of no substitute for victory is giving away to negotiation.

A: That's all right as long as you can get by with it; but when it gets you down and you are going to lose it, I don't think we can negotiate very far with the present Russians because he is not going to take defeat or setbacks. He makes up his mind that he is going to go out and win the war, I believe. That's my belief, and I don't think there is going to be any halfway steps about it.

Q: Yes, sir, if he can do it without shooting, he'll do it that way.

A: He'll do it any way, but when he gets into it, he is in it to win. And it is going to wind up eventually that way.

Q: Do you think the United Nations is a viable form to prevent war?

A: No, I think it's practically useless; as far as I can see, they've done nothing, nothing so far. Well, of course, they've let in all these other people now, with all the little countries and the Africans and what not in it, and they all are disruptive. If it was limited to the major powers, we might get someplace. Today I think it is absolutely a forum, a debating forum that means nothing.

Q: Do you think there should be an adjunct to the United Nations representing the major powers of the world?

A: Well, I don't know what the adjunct is; I don't think this other thing is worth anything. Those people have no right to decide what's going to happen, but they have just as much a voice. They can get up and debate and carry on and disrupt the whole proceedings, and they have done that any number of times. And some of them only represent maybe 200,000 or 300,000 people, some of these nations, and they have a full voice in there; of course, they are not on the Security Council. The Security Council is the only thing worth anything, I believe, in the United Nations. The rest of it takes up time and it's a waste of money and everything else.

Q: Do you think the veto policy in the Security Council prevents it from making any major lasting decisions?

A: Well, I guess you've got to have it, because if you didn't have the veto it could override-of course, the Security Council is limited to how many nations—only about six or eight.

Q: It was five.

A: But really the only ones that count in that are Russia and the United States, plus Great Britain and France have dropped out. Japan has

developed considerably. I don't know whether China is in that now or not; are they on the Security Council?

Q: I believe they are now.

A: Most of those people are nothing, mean nothing, and it is just used to waste money and sound off. Nobody pays any attention to them.

Q: Well, the Korean conflict-we fought in that under the United Nations flag.

A: And the only reason we were able was the Russians weren't represented, because he would have vetoed it. That was a big mistake on the Russian's part; he wasn't present at the time that war was declared.

Q: Let me change subjects again, sir; I want to get to something that's been rather ticklish since Vietnam or came out of Korea and that's on the Code of Conduct. What are your thoughts on the Code of Conduct—whether or not the average soldier understands it, and do you think it is too restrictive or not restrictive enough?

A: The Code of Conduct, I think, is all right. I believe in the Code of Conduct as enunciated. I don't know if Vietnam has changed a lot of that with imprisonment, and I don't know what those people had a right to do when they were incarcerated with nobody to help them for years. I don't know what they suffered. You get so many different reports. It's all nothing but newspaper that I've ever heard about the thing.

Q: A lot of the newspaper reports, particularly after the prisoners were released, were accurate. Going from that to another situation related, you probably heard the news yesterday or today that Secretary of the Army has reduced [the sentence of] Lieutenant Calley, who was involved in the My Lai massacre, for the murder of 22 civilians. His sentence was reduced from 20 to 10 years because of the possibility that he might have been, in his own mind, following orders and doing a legal thing. Do you have any thoughts on that thing?

A: I think it's fine that they did it. I think he has suffered enough. Of course, you take a young lieutenant like that who came in from civilian life. I don't know what his education or background was, but to put him in that situation and then hold him wholly responsible for that massacre. There are things that went on I don't know. I am just talking about what I've read in the newspapers and heard from reports, but the Vietnamese I don't think were so innocent of the whole business; and I think there were mines set off and of all sorts. Maybe there was infiltration from North Vietnam, I don't know, but you couldn't trust anything whether they were man or woman or child at the time. As I remember the accounts of his attack, there had been a massacre of some Americans in that same area not long before, and they were either killed by mines or something like that.

Q: Ambushed.

A: The whole thing is so mixed up as to who is Vietnamese north and who is the south, and then you had those communists mixed in with the whole thing. I don't think anybody could tell friend from foe. Is that right?

Q: Yes, that's true, whether a Viet Cong or NVA [North Vietnamese Army] or—

A: So, those people were protecting their own lives; and those soldiers went sort of wild, but there were soldiers who had friends who were killed previous to that. They were out for revenge, shoot anything that moved. I think he was unjustly convicted.

Q: After you retired in Europe in 1955, you became Chairman of the Board of Interlake Steel?

A: Interlake Steel, Interlake Iron at that time. It is now Interlake Steel,

Q: What were your feelings on your transition from your high military position into that relatively high business position?

A: Well, I was delighted to have the opportunity. I was going to seed so damned fast in that little town in Missouri, nothing to do, poor as a church mouse. I hadn't gotten a raise. I had been reduced in my pay. I was later raised back to drawing retirement pay of a general, but at that time, I had to go back to major general; and I could live on it all right but I couldn't do anything. And I got this office which to me was fabulous, and the amount of money. So I immediately grabbed it and came here, and they treated me marvelously well. I knew nothing about the steel industry, iron industry, or any of the rest of it, but they all helped me in every way. There was never any jealousy that I know of, and I don't know that I did much for them. Except that we were in some contract difficulties with some plant we were building over in Chicago. They were slow and were running way ahead of estimate, and I got that straightened out; but they were two or three times over our budget, and we couldn't keep up with the money we were spending. We were building coke ovens and a conveyer belt across from the Chicago side—it was all in Chicago, but it went across a distance of a couple of miles—to carry the coke from the coke ovens over to the furnaces, which were on the other side. The thing worked all right, except I did have trouble. It broke down once or twice, due to the poor design; and as I say, the estimate they were slow in getting anything finished, and we finally got that straightened out. That's about the only thing I could add to their help. I went up and saw the mines. I learned slowly, I learned on the job. But it was a good experience. I was dealing with good men, and they were very helpful. I was all over the Mesabi Range [Minnesota], went to a number of our mines with other people. We were associated at that time with the Bethlehem Steel and the Steel Company of Canada, very close. We were in partnership, and we later opened up some mines in Manitoba-no, Labrador, under the same group. All that part was very interesting. It ran into considerable money. I don't know that I did them any good.

Q: Well, did you find that with your experience in the military, you were so adaptive in so many different jobs that you did; you think that prepared you quite well?

A: Well, primarily it was dealing with those contractors; that was about the only experience I had. But trying to get the contractor straightened out—and they were not doing a damned thing except getting deeper and deeper in debt. I did get that thing whipped around until we got it back on a decent basis.

Q: Well, did your experience as District Engineer, in working with contractors, help any?

A: I think that it helped me considerably. It's the only experience that I had with contractors. I had some idea what a contractor was and what the performance should be, so I was able to press that point. I don't know that I did them any good. But they were fine, and there was no backlighting; there was no jealousy among those people. They couldn't have treated me better.

Q: How about the management techniques of the Army versus the business community?

A: I don't know. There was not a great deal of difference between the management technique we had in the Corps of Engineers or Civil Works; that is, as far as I know, there was not. I had no difficulty in adjusting to that. We had the cost keeping, the budgeting, and all of that in the engineer works, and we had the same thing when we got in business.

Q: Did you find any difference in the reaction time to your directives in the Army versus business?

A: I don't know whether I can answer.

Q: Some retired military officers complained that in the Army they put out an order and they could depend on it being done. In a civilian community, you put out an order and it may or may not be done.

A: Well, if they didn't, you followed up on it. I don't know if I had any particular difficulty with it. Well, they were cooperative, very helpful, nice people to work with; and it was a salvation for me to get anything to do, except die of dry rot, which I was doing fast. I wouldn't have lasted a year or two back there in retirement.

Q: How long were you in retirement before you went with Interlake?

A: Oh, about a year-yes, a year and a half. I had retired in January of 1955. I came here in February. We spent a year-six or eight months in Europe, before I came home. We came back to the United States in 1955, fall of 1955, and I came to Cleveland in 1956. I was back there maybe a year, living in Lexington after I retired, doing nothing.

Q: Yes, you retired in January 1955.

A: Well, I spent the rest of that year-I didn't get back to the States until that fall, sometime like that, and then we went to Lexington to fix up the old home, which was inherited-and that was a great mistake and a waste of money. But what little I had was all in that house, and when I wound up, I had nothing. You couldn't take that old house or do anything with it. But I was finally able to sell it after, later after Mrs. Hoge died. She was devoted to the place and primarily desired that we went back there to live. I had no plans, and I think that is a great mistake with people who retire. You should have something; all I thought about it was that I'd have my fill of doing hunting and fishing and traveling. Well, I had no money for traveling. There wasn't any fishing nearby. There was very little hunting in Missouri, but otherwise I had nothing to do except cut the grass and lawn work. I was just going to seed.

But this opportunity came along; it furnished what we needed in the way of income and an interesting job. Now I think an Army officer who retires has got one thing he should do; go someplace where he has some other officers, friends to be with. That's the reason I do think you should go to a place like Florida, California, or maybe San Antonio. Washington, DC, isn't bad, because I have many classmates around Washington; not many, but those I have are there. Anybody to be associated with. But when you've been away from your hometown for 40 years, and most of the people have died that I knew as a boy or young man, and when I got back there I was spending more time being a pallbearer for somebody's funeral. All of them are too old and I had nothing in common with them except that they were all nice to me. They wanted to elect me mayor of the town. I wouldn't take that, but anyway I was very fortunate to get the job at Interlake. But my advice would be to plan something, some activity, before you retire; and by all means, unless you have some activity that will take up your time, go where your friends are that you've known in recent times–your Army friends, that's about all you have then. And these retirement colonies that you have in

these various places are all right; but this other thing, of just coming out into civilian life that you had known 40 years or 50 years before, is no good.

Q: Yes, I imagine that it is very good advice.

A: I think one of the things was Mrs. Hoge's longing to go back to her own home. She had two or three girl friends, women friends, who were living there; I had one or two men friends, but they were dying, or did die, and I never had anything to do, just waste time. About the biggest thing I ever had to do was to go to the Rotary Club whenever they had it, once a month—it was terrible.

Q: Sir, we've covered an awful lot of topics in about 12 hours of our discussion, and I feel I might have restricted you a little bit on some of the things you might have liked to talk about. Are there any subjects you would like to bring up that we haven't discussed or something you'd like to add.

A: I don't know of anything. I'm willing to try to answer anything you want to know about.

Q: This has been one of the best experiences I have had. I personally appreciate your hospitality in engaging in this.

A: I haven't been very hospitable. I have not been in the position to do it. Daisy has been sick quite often, and sometimes I think she won't be able to get my meals or anything even on the table or to cook; and she has been in the hospital two or three times, so I didn't have very much to offer you.

Q: It has been very fine, sir, as far as the program is concerned. I'm sure I can speak for General Davis, the Commandant, and Colonel Pappas [George S. Pappas, USMA 1944], Director of the MHRC [Military History Research Collection], who were very appreciative of your participation in this program. And if later on, readers get as much out of

it as I have discussing it with you, I' m sure it's going to be extremely worthwhile.

A: I hope so, but I doubt if anybody will ever see it.